

OCT. 31. 2007 3:05PM

NO. 2566

P. 1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

FAX TRANSMISSION

DATE: October 31, 2007

PTO IDENTIFIER: Application Number 10/787,037-Conf. #3898
Patent Number

Inventor: Akira Sugiyama

MESSAGE TO: US Patent and Trademark Office

FAX NUMBER: (571) 273-8300

FROM: EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
David G. Conlin

PHONE: (617) 517-5515

Attorney Dkt. #: 60896(70551)

PAGES (Including Cover Sheet): 6

CONTENTS: Statement of the Substance of the Interview (4 pages)
Certificate of Transmission (1 page)

If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to sender at (617) 517-5515 and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address below.

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited.

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874, Boston, Massachusetts 02205
Telephone: (617) 239-0100 Facsimile: (617) 227-4420

OCT 31 2007

PTO/SB/97 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0891-0091

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application No. (if known): 10/787,037

Attorney Docket No.: 60896(70551)

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

on October 31, 2007
Date


Signature

Helen Murray Tarbi

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

(617) 239-0100
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Statement of the Substance of the Interview (4 pages)

Attorney Docket No. 60896 (70551)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

APPLICANT: A. Sugiyama
SER NO.: 10/787,037 ART UNIT: 1763
FILED: February 24, 2004 EXAMINER: Karla A. Moore
TITLE: *PLASMA PROCESSING APPARATUS*

VIA FACSIMILE

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

On October 16, 2007, Applicants' representatives David G. Conlin and Marc Gorayeb participated in a telephonic interview with Examiner Karla Moore involving the above-identified application. An Amendment and Response to the Final Office action dated June 15 2007 had been mailed on September 6, 2007. An Advisory Action was mailed on September 18, 2007.

During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed the following:

- Pending independent claim 1, and dependent claims 4 and 9
- Cited reference Okumura et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/027945)

Applicants' representatives did not propose any claim amendments during the interview. A general result of the telephonic interview was that agreement was not reached, but Examiner Moore indicated that Applicants' representatives should submit their position in writing for further consideration.

Attorney Docket No. 60896 (70551)
Application Ser. No. 10/787,037
Applicant: A. Sugiyama

Examiner: Karla A. Moore
Art Unit: 1763

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 31 2007

Remarks

As detailed in Applicants' reply to the Final Office Action, the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the Examiner related to the failure of the Okamura et al. reference to disclose at least the following claimed attributes:

- the provision of a gas supply to the treatment space by an inlet in the first electrode, and simultaneously the provision of a gas exhaust from the treatment space by an outlet in the second electrode, with both electrodes facing the surface of the object being treated.
- The conversion of the gas to plasma in the space immediately overlying the surface of the object being treated.
- The availability of substantially all of the supplied gas for treatment of the object, and the exhausting of the plasma from the supplied gas through the outlet in the second electrode.
- The advantages of a plasma flow that is substantially parallel to the surface of the object being treated, which avoids perpendicular impingement of plasma gas onto the surface of the object.

The applicants' representatives pointed out that Okumura et al. fails to teach the placement of a gas inlet in one electrode, and a gas outlet in the second electrode, both facing the surface of the object being treated and generating a plasma as the gas flows parallel to the object. In Okumura et al., the plasma is formed in a space between two facing electrodes, in a manner designed to cause plasma to forcefully impinge the surface of the object being treated. See, e.g., Figs. 10, 11A, 11B, 16, 21, 25 (prior art) and 29A. In every case, the plasma is formed in a plasma space 3 in a manner that it is directed against the surface of the substrate to be treated. Although it is disclosed that the gas can be supplied to that space through the electrode itself, that makes no difference in the operation of Okumura as far as the present claims are concerned. The

Attorney Docket No. 60896 (70551)
Application Ser. No. 10/787,037
Applicant: A. Sugiyama

Examiner: Karla A. Moore
Art Unit: 1763

plasma is still formed between the electrodes and shot down to impinge the substrate surface. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the concept of supplying it through the electrode through the first dielectric surface which opposes the substrate surface and is located between the object and the first electrode (claim 1, third and fourth paragraphs). Nor is there a disclosure of simultaneously exhausting the processing gas through an exhaust opening through a second surface which also opposes the surface of the substrate (claim 1, third and fifth paragraphs). The concept of forming and moving the plasma parallel to the surface of the substrate is foreign to Okumura. If, as required by the third paragraph of claim 1, the dielectric completely filled the space between the electrodes (i.e., plasma space 3) in Okumura, that device would not work at all. Nothing in any of the other references of record, or any reasonable combination of them, makes up for the contrary teachings of Okumura.

It was noted that dependent claim 4 even more specifically recites that the coated surfaces of the first and second electrodes extend on a plane parallel to the surface of the object.

The applicant's representatives also noted that much of the plasma formed according to Okumura et al. appears to be exhausted before ever contacting the surface of the object being treated. In fact Okumura et al. teaches that exhausting 70% or more of the gas via the gas exhaust outlet helps to prevent the exhausting of gas from the opening overlying the object being treated. (Okumura et al. at para. 0158). In contrast, Applicants' invention is capable of utilizing substantially all of the plasma generated to treat the object, and is also capable of exhausting substantially all of the plasma through the second electrode after it passes over the object, as recited in dependent claim 9. The Okumura et al. device cannot function effectively unless at least some of the plasma escapes along the opening overlying the object being treated.

Although claim 12 was not specifically discussed during the interview, Applicants' representatives also wish to respond herein to the September 18, 2007 Advisory Action comments regarding that claim. Claim 12 recites a third electrode positioned next to the second electrode opposite the first electrode, and requires that the apparatus is formed in symmetry with respect to the second electrode. Electrode polarity is inherently part of this symmetry, since if a

OCT 31 2007

Attorney Docket No. 60896 (70551)
Application Ser. No. 10/787,037
Applicant: A. Sugiyama

Examiner: Karla A. Moore
Art Unit: 1763


third electrode of the same polarity as the second electrode were placed on the opposite side of the second electrode from the first electrode, the structure would not be symmetrical with respect to the second electrode.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' representatives sincerely thank Examiner Moore for her time and attention to this application. In view of the foregoing remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited. Should any fee be required for this submission to be considered (including extensions of time), the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account number 04-1105.

Respectfully submitted,
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

Attorney for the Applicant



David G. Conlin, Esq.
Registration No. 27,026
Marc Gorayeb, Esq.
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
Tel. (617) 517-5509
Customer No. 21874

Dated: October 31, 2007